REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to an Office Action mailed August 8, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (first paragraph) and claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Request for Examiner's Interview

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney if after review, such claims are still not in condition for allowance. This telephone conference would greatly facilitate the examination of the present application. The undersigned attorney can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being in non-compliance with the written description requirement. Applicants respectively traverse the rejection, but have amended claim 1 to clarity that the personal content directors substitute the Base URI for a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) Base tag within each of the first packets provided by the personal content director. Based on this amendment, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 rejection as applied to claim 1.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,598) in view of Aviani (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,044). Claims 14-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).* Herein, the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all the claim limitations.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Farber nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest the operation of substituting the Base URI for a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) Base tag within each of the first packets by the personal content directors of at least the first and second local domains. In contrast, Farber teaches a BASE directive, which specifies the resource at the reflector and allows the HTML resource to identify a different base server. *See Col. 16, lines 47-48 of Farber.* The BASE directive differs from the HTML Base tag because the HTML Base tag is used to point to the *local domain* of a

personal content director (PCD). *Emphasis added.* The Base directive does not provide such teachings and identifies that it specifies the resource at the reflector which *originally served the resource. Emphasis added.* This reflector is not equivalent to the multiple personal content directors as claimed.

Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection as applied to independent claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon be withdrawn. For example, dependent claim 4 was previously amended to include the limitation that the transmission of the first packets is synchronized through an exchange of time synchronization messages over separate Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection. Such limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber and Aviani in view of Beckerman (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,200) and claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aviani, Beckerman and Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,376). Applicants still traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. However, claims 13 and 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice so that no further discussion as to the grounds for traversing the rejection is necessary.

Withdrawal of the outstanding §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 13 and 19-20 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 6, 2006 By _____

William W. Schaal
Reg. No. 39,018
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☐ *deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.*

Date: 11/06/2006

FACSIMILE

☒ *transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.*

11/06/2006
Susan McFarlane *Date*